

## REMARKS

Claims 6, 7, 10-13, 16-19, and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 are withdrawn. Claims 6-21 are rejected. Claims 8, 9, 14, and 20 are cancelled. Claims 6, 7, 10-12, and 16-18 are amended. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the Application.

### Election/Restrictions

Applicants respectfully elect, with traverse, the invention of claims 6-21, for continued prosecution in this application. However, the invention of claims 1-5 is not separate and distinct from the invention of claims 6-21 for at least the following reasons. Both claim 1 and claim 6 are directed to systems that use AVC rules to compare proposed posting of revenue with limits on the revenue. Given the related nature of independent claims 1 and 6, all such claims should be examined in full. Further, there is no evidence that the prosecution of claims 1-6 would cause the examiner undue burden.

### Claim Amendments

Claims 6 has been amended to identify the acronym AVC to conform to the Office Action.

### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (U.S. Patent 6,058,375) ("Park".) Applicants disagree. The amended claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

Consider a portion of amended claim 10, which recites in part:

responsive to a proposed postings of revenue, determining whether the revenue calculation for any control objects addresses the proposed posting, executing AVC rules for each identified control object, **the AVC rules testing whether the proposed postings of revenue would exceed revenue limits for the control object**, and

if any AVC rule is violated by the posting and if the AVC rule identifies an error as a response thereto, **blocking the posting from being admitted**

The bolded portion of amended claim 10 is not disclosed by Park. The Office Action alleges that the bolded portion is disclosed by Park at Col. 32, Lines 52-60, and Col. 33, Lines 1-6, Col. 35, Lines 4-9, but Park discloses rules that operate on "balancing principles" (Park, Col. 32, Line 59, and at Col. 33, Line 5, and at Col. 35, Line 8). In Park there is a debit and credit side of a transaction that forms the basis for whether a transaction is accepted. (Park, Col. 33, Lines 3-

4). There is simple nothing in Park that discloses or suggests "**blocking the posting from being admitted**" based on "**whether the proposed postings of revenue would exceed revenue limits for the control object.**"

Applicants would like to note the following portion of the specification:

The inventors perceive a need in the art for an EMA system that manages revenues as they are received by an organization to compare them with predetermined requirements established for the organization.

Pending Application, ¶6. And, Applicants would also like to note that some of the reasons for providing a means for controlling revenue is explained in the following portion of the specification:

Some organizations ... particularly public sector organizations or non-governmental organizations (NGOs), are not free to accept revenue from any source that becomes available to it.

...

it [the organization] may choose to limit revenues it earns from such leases to remain faithful to its charter as an organization devoted to research.

...

In another example, an NGO [organization] may solicit grants from various donor organizations to support its operations. At the same time, the organization may limit the grant revenue that it receives from any single donor to maintain independence from that donor organization.

Pending Application, ¶¶4 and 5.

Therefore, amended claim 10 is not disclosed or suggested by Park. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 is requested. Since, claims 11-13 and 15 depend from claim 10, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11-13 and 15 is also requested.

Additionally, consider a portion of amended claim 16, which recites in part:

responsive to a proposed postings of revenue, determine whether the revenue calculation for any control objects addresses the proposed posting, execute Availability Control (AVC) rules for each identified control object, **the AVC rules testing whether the proposed postings of revenue would exceed revenue limits for the control object, and** if any AVC rule is violated by the posting and if the AVC rule identifies an error as a response thereto, **block the posting from being admitted**

As discussed above for claim 10, the bolded portion is not disclosed or suggested by Park. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is requested. Since, claims 17-19 and 21 depend from claim 16, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17-19 and 21 is also requested.

Additionally, consider a portion of amended claim 6, which recites in part:

a transaction manager to receive new revenue transactions posted by an organization,  
an Availability Control (AVC) manager, responsive to a new revenue transaction to execute an AVC rule represented by a control object, **the AVC rule causing a comparison of previously-posted revenue of the organization and revenue of the new transaction with a limit to how much revenue may be posted for the control object** and, if the comparison fails a relationship defined by the AVC rule, causing the transaction manager **to reject the new revenue transaction**.

As discussed above for claim 10, the bolded portion is not disclosed or suggested by Park. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is requested. Since, claim 7 depends from claim 6, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is also requested.

Applicants: Thomas M. Schaub, et al.  
Serial No. 10/743,143  
Response to Office Action mailed October 2, 2007

### **CONCLUSION**

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-220-4228 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: February 4, 2008

Gregory R. Grace  
Registration No. 59, 733

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP  
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005-1257  
Tel.: (202) 220-4200  
Fax.: (202) 220-4201